

enjoyed certain privileges, were so embittered that they too began undermining, rather than strengthening, discipline."

Today, every movement of Khrushchev has been in the direction of more force and repression. The significance of Kazakhstan is that it is the "last straw." As it has provided only a new seat of agricultural mutiny and sabotage worse than any of the others, it has exhausted Khrushchev's last conceivable answer to the problem of providing an expanding food-economy at home, produced by willing farmers under the Communist system. At the same time it has heightened the rebellious spirit everywhere in the Soviet Union, as Molotov, Bulganin, Kaganovich, Shepilov, etc., had warned.

Khrushchev, in his speeches delivered on September 28 and October 9, 1963, reiterated his old theory of abolishing the collective farms altogether and transforming them into untenanted state farms adjacent to agricultural cities where the farmers are day-laboring apartment dwellers, without homes on the soil or household farming plots. If he make up his mind to forge ahead, Dr. Fabian predicts that he must anticipate open revolt.

Khrushchev's fertilizer speech of last December 9 was an old excuse, warmed over. He cannot admit before the world that it is the rebellion of his people that is at the core of his troubles. "Plenty of fertilizer has been delivered to the farms in the past, and is a pet object of peasant sabotage," writes Dr. Fabian. "They have stored it openly in the rain to leach out, and they have applied it in overdoses to burn out crop lands."

The following day, December 10, it was left to G. I. Voronov, Premier of the Russian Republic, to raise the ominous subject of disciplining the peasants with more "education." It would be necessary to teach the peasants how to use fertilizer, said Voronov, for Khrushchev's fertilizer program would be wasted if it was not properly used "as a result of ignorance or prejudice on the part of the peasants." Skirting any confession of sabotage, he mentioned problems of transporting chemicals from factories to fields. He told the central committee that 15 to 20 percent of the present fertilizer output and sometimes more is being lost in transportation and storage.

There is every indication that foreign wheat purchases will be used to see the regime through a new attempt to discipline the peasants, in a final death struggle between the Red regime and its people. When the December party meeting closed, it scheduled a new plenum within 2 months, instead of the usual six, with the food problem to be the chief one on the agenda.

The U.S. Congress cooled noticeably toward the wheat deals after the December meeting in Moscow. It finally gave the President permission to endorse private sales of wheat to the Soviet Union (which means guaranteeing sellers that they'll get their money), but washed its hands of responsibility by stipulating that President Johnson could guarantee the sales if in his judgment it was in the best interests of the United States. Very shortly thereafter, the first sale was consummated, a private dealer negotiating sale of 1 million tons of wheat to the Soviet Union at U.S. support prices, Moscow paying a lower price and the United States providing the difference. It was reported to be the biggest single sale of wheat ever made.

#### ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as new information continues to reach the United States confirming official Soviet

acts of persecution and discrimination against members of the Jewish religion, it becomes increasingly important for U.S. citizens to express their deepening concern over the situation. Word has been received that the prosecution in the long and secret trial of a number of Moscow residents has called for the death penalty for the 11 Jews charged with economic crimes. For the 12 non-Jews charged with the same offense the prosecution asked only prison terms of 15 years.

It is ironic to note that the crime of which these 23 are accused is operating a knitting mill secretly in the workshop of a neurological institute near Moscow. For their initiative and efforts to increase the gross national product of the Soviet Union, the 11 Jews, considered ringleaders, face the death sentence. The trial, originally expected to be a "show" trial with great publicity and public impact, was for unknown reasons carried out entirely in camera. Perhaps even the Communists realized that a public trial on such an issue would be viewed as a terrible farce in other parts of the world. Certainly, there is a startling contrast between Soviet propaganda efforts to prevent capital punishment of a handful of convicted spies and espionage agents in the United States and Soviet Government demands for a death penalty for operating a knitting mill.

In July 1961, the Soviet Union took a great step backwards in reintroducing the death sentence for so-called economic crimes. Of the 190 persons so far believed to have been tried since that time, well over half are estimated as Jewish.

In view of the continuing Soviet campaign of anti-Semitism, I asked the Department of State for a full report on the subject urging U.S. action to prevent such excesses. The report I have just received from the Department of State, although in some respects satisfactory and straightforward in its admission of anti-Semitic activities in the Soviet Union, still leaves a major issue unresolved. The State Department concedes that the Jewish community whether regarded as a religious sect or a nationality, suffers serious hardship. Nevertheless, the State Department maintains "There is no evidence that the authorities intend to incite the public to acts of anti-Jewish violence. Rather, they seem to be using popular anti-Semitic sentiments for their own purpose."

While reviewing the problem in some detail, the Department of State again concludes that action by the U.S. Government through diplomatic channels would not be useful, or in the best interests of Soviet Jews. Instead, the Department of State emphasizes the value of private appeals from Jewish and other religious organizations to make known the continuing concern held throughout the world about the Soviet action against religious minorities within the Soviet Union.

Although I am encouraged that the Department of State has given further thought and attention to this problem, I

am, at the same time, disturbed by the Department's reluctance to put the full and appropriate measure of blame upon the intensive activities and campaign of the Soviet Government itself. The fact that "official Soviet spokesmen consistently deny the existence of any anti-Semitic bias in Soviet policy" is no reason for the citizens of the United States to accept without protest this continuing Soviet prejudice and injustice.

I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the Record the text of the memorandum prepared by the Department of State on the subject of the "Situation of Jews in the Soviet Union."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### SITUATION OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

The long-term antireligious campaign in the Soviet Union has grown in intensity over the past several years and all religions, including the Jewish religion, are being subjected to increasing restrictions, forms of interference, and negative social pressures. These pressures are brought to bear against various minority groups in the Soviet Union and in the case of the Jewish people prevent the normal maintenance and development of their religious, social, and cultural life.

Soviet publications carry many articles attacking religious observances, ridiculing believers, and even accusing them of anti-government activities. Similar attacks are featured on Soviet radio and television and in public lectures. They are supplemented by atheist propaganda in the schools, where children are taught from the earliest grades that adherence to a religious faith is immoral and evidence of weakness or even depravity.

The antireligious campaign which began with the establishment of the Soviet Government in 1918, although varying in intensity at times, continues unabated. Religious sects not affiliated with the major churches have recently been the particular focus of attack. Lengthy reports and articles in the Soviet press describe the court trials in which members of such groups have been tried and sentenced for allegedly corrupting Soviet youth by teaching them religious practices.

The Soviet Government has denounced the excesses and "crimes" of the Stalin era, but at no time has there been any increased tolerance of religion in domestic policy. Furthermore, in the past year or two there have been growing indications of an active, anti-Semitic bias which have made the Soviet Jews apprehensive for their future. Official Soviet spokesmen nevertheless, consistently deny the existence of any anti-Semitic bias in Soviet policies.

While the amount of pressure on the Jewish community varies from time to time, official and unofficial reports are in agreement that anti-Semitic prejudices persist among the people of many areas of the Soviet Union. Some of these prejudices can be traced back to the czarist era of Russian history. While all observers agree that Soviet Jews are being placed under increasing restrictions with regard to religious worship, the U.S. Government has no information indicating that Soviet Jews fear physical persecution of the type of magnitude which was directed against them during czarist times or during the immediate postwar period under Stalin.

There is no doubt that Soviet press reports and commentary concerning some of the economic trials have been written in such a way as to emphasize the Jewish identity

of some of the defendants, an emphasis which would not escape the attention of Soviet Jews or of those elements of the Soviet citizenry which retain strong anti-Semitic prejudices. In the recent past, Soviet press coverage of economic crimes has indicated that Jews are being sentenced, often to death, in disproportionately large numbers. At the same time, other population elements, including non-Jewish Communist Party members and public officials, have figured as defendants in trials for economic crimes and have received the extreme penalty. The best speculation as to official motives in publicizing these economic crimes is that the Soviet Government wishes to frighten potential economic "criminals" by the harsh deterrent penalties while deflecting adverse public reactions to the harshness of these sentences by playing upon the anti-Semitic sentiment that exists in the population. There is no evidence that the authorities intend to incite the public to acts of anti-Jewish violence. Rather, they seem to be using popular anti-Semitic sentiments for their own purpose.

Judaism is one of the 11 recognized religious sects in the U.S.S.R. and fares better than nonrecognized groups, especially those such as Jehovah's Witnesses which espouse pacifism. However, Soviet Jews have not been permitted any sort of national or provincial organization secular or religious, such as other nationality groups and the recognized religious sects have had. Each synagogue struggles along on its own. The number of synagogues is being quietly reduced. Press treatment of synagogues, and of references to Jewish identity generally has almost always placed them in an unfavorable context. Worship is circumscribed not only by the paucity of synagogues and rabbinical training, but by restrictions affecting traditional foods and customs.

Jews are treated as a nationality, regardless of religious practice, and the nationality listed in their identity documents is that of "Jew." Their distinctive language activities and community institutions have now been reduced almost to zero, unlike those of other national groups. Any more than the present minimal level of Yiddish-language activities is discouraged. The territorial Jewish "homeland" projected in Birobjan is an admitted failure. There is strong pressure toward assimilation, and a marked assimilation in practice; yet the compulsory nationality label remains.

Jews are well represented in the artistic and scientific professions, and are relatively numerous in the middle levels of the economic hierarchy. But they have lost the strong position at top levels of the party that was held after the revolution, and are virtually excluded from sensitive areas of the bureaucracy and the army. Their relative position in the professions is certain to fall as more non-Jews become qualified with the spread of education. Jews probably have a higher average income than other groups, but it is something of a disadvantage for individuals of given career potential to be Jewish.

The existence of Israel renders Soviet Jews vulnerable to official attack on grounds of divided loyalty; emigration is forbidden. They are also suspect for having ties with Western Jewry, and contacts with foreigners are discouraged.

While the Department of State has no basis on which to assess authenticity of charges made against either Jewish or any other defendants in these trials, the publicity given such trials would surely buttress already existing anti-Semitic prejudices through the association of identifiably Jewish persons with alleged criminal violations. There recently has been a decline in such publicity, although the number of Jewish names among those reported as sentenced remains disproportionately high.

Regarding possible remedial action on behalf of Soviet Jews by the U.S. Government through diplomatic channels, the Department continues to believe that formal U.S. Government representations to the Soviet Government would not be in the best interest of Soviet Jews. These representations could in fact antagonize the Soviet Government to the detriment of Soviet Jews. In the past, the Soviet Government has often accused Soviet Jews of susceptibility to subversive foreign influences and of being agents of foreign states, most particularly of the United States and Israel. It hardly would be to the interest of Soviet Jews for the United States to take actions which would seem to lend credence to this charge. Formal actions by the U.S. Government or its official representatives could have this unfortunate result and also lose in effectiveness because of the tendency in many areas to dismiss U.S. moves involving the Soviet Union as motivated primarily by cold war considerations.

Where feasible, the U.S. Government can and does support moves designed to bring about an improvement in the lot of Soviet Jewry, reduce the negative pressures on their religious life, and restore their opportunities to enjoy their rich cultural heritage. The situation of the Jews and other minorities in the Soviet Union is a subject of continuing concern to the U.S. Government. Within the inherent limitations mentioned above, the Department will continue to work for an improvement in the life of the Jewish people of the Soviet Union.

Appeals by private organizations and individuals to the Soviet authorities are believed most likely to bring about a change in Soviet policy affecting Soviet Jews. Such appeals might heighten the Soviet Government's sensitivity on this subject and encourage a decrease in its mistreatment of these unfortunate people.

Since the fate of Soviet Jewry is of concern to the world community, serious thought might be given to a united appeal of private organizations representing worldwide Jewry and, if possible, other religious groups.

#### FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in recent months there has been an increasing attack on the use of Federal funds for public housing and urban renewal purposes. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for example, has advocated that local chambers should oppose communities accepting such aid. An editorial which appeared last Sunday in the South Bend Tribune pointed out the ineffectiveness of this type of approach. Because this editorial raises a question which is worthy of serious consideration, I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

##### BARKING UP WRONG TREE

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce contends that the Federal public housing and urban renewal programs have the effect of taking from the poor to subsidize the rich. Accordingly, it has urged local chamber of commerce units to go on record in support of local responsibility for public housing and renewal projects.

Whatever may be said of the virtue of self-reliance, it is hard to subscribe to the theory that local communities should turn their backs on Federal assistance when it is available.

The only result of a refusal by South Bend, for instance, to accept Federal assistance for a local project would be to make more money available to cities which reject the chamber of commerce local-responsibility concept.

If the chamber of commerce really wants an end to federally assisted public housing, urban renewal and perhaps other things, it ought to concentrate its efforts on Congress. It is doubtful that it will get to first base advising local communities to reject Federal aid as long as Congress goes on making funds available.

Call it taking from the poor to help the rich or whatever you please, this is the way it is.

Those who would have South Bend renounce Federal assistance for worthy public works, including public housing if the need is clearly demonstrated, aren't facing up to realities. For the truth is that as long as the Federal funds are made available they will be spent somewhere in the United States. As Federal taxpayers, the people of South Bend surely are entitled to a fair share in the allotments.

Would anyone suggest today that the people of his community should reject Federal road construction help when it is available? The principle is the same.

#### A COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRACY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Congress is under attack from many quarters. There are those who clamor for so-called reforms and changes in the organization and operation of the legislative branch of the National Government.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I have had ample opportunity to review and study many of these suggestions. Some have merit; most do not.

One of the most thoughtful discussions of this problem is contained in an address by my colleague, Senator HRUSKA, to a University of Nebraska Convocation in Lincoln on February 13. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that excerpts from Senator HRUSKA's well-reasoned remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

##### A COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRACY

(Excerpts from the remarks of Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, University of Nebraska, February 13, 1964)

One can turn in any direction these days and see government on trial. I do not limit myself to democratic forms of government, although that is what concerns us most. Man seems to be losing his struggle to live in a stable society, protected in his personal rights and free to further his individual interests, as mobs take matters in their own hands.

Perhaps too much was expected too soon of the newly formed nations carved out of the great colonial empires of the 19th century. The reports from across Africa and southeast Asia would dishearten the incorrigible optimist as government after government topples or teeters on the brink of anarchy. The tide of rising expectations, as Governor Stevenson described the times, is ebbing.

More disappointing, perhaps, is the pattern unfolding in our own hemisphere, where nations endowed with strong constitutions are endangered by philosophies alien to their soil. We have taken a special interest in these nations, flattered that they found our system of government most to their liking. Although our cultures stem from different